arXiv:hep-ph/9810502v1 28 Oct 1998

Approximate Flavor Symmetry in Supersymmetric Model

Zhijian Tao

China Center of Advanced Science and Technology, (World Laboratory)
Theory Division, Institute of High Energy Physics, Academia Sinica
Beijing 100039, China

Abstract

We investigate the maximal approximate flavor symmetry in the framework of generic minimal supersymmetric standard model. We consider the low energy effective theory of the flavor physics with all the possible operators included. Spontaneous flavor symmetry breaking leads to the approximate flavor symmetry in Yukawa sector and the supersymmetry breaking sector. Fermion mass and mixing hierachies are the results of the hierachy of the flavor symmetry breaking. It is found that in this theory it is possible to solve the flavor changing problems. Furthermore baryogenesis of the universe can be well described and neutron electric dipole moment is closely below it experimental bound by assuming approximate CP violating phase $\sim 10^{-2}$ and superpartner mass around 100 GeV.

In the Standard Model (SM), understanding of the patterns of fermion mass and mixing remains as one of the most challenging problem. The Yukawa couplings, with too many parameters, can account for the observed fermion mass and mixing. However it does not answer the question why there exists the observed fermion mass and mixing hierarchy. CP violation phase in Cabbibo-Kobayashi-Maskawa (CKM) matrix is also a free parameter. One has no idea about how large the phase should be from any first principle. And in the framework of the SM this phase is determined to be order of one in order to explain the CP violation measured in K meson system. However in the extensions of the SM if there are other sources of CP violation, the CKM phase is not determined at all. While the SM provides no understanding of the fermion mass and mixing problem, from some physical consideration based on flavor symmetry in some beyond SM it may provides an opportunity to understand better this problem [1]. It has been noticed that in the SM, the gauge interaction respects a maximal flavor symmetry $G_f = U(3)_Q \times U(3)_U \times U(3)_D \times U(3)_L \times U(3)_E$, where Q and L are SU(2) doublet quarks and leptons, U, D, E are singlet quarks and leptons respectively. Yukawa coupling sectors, though, do not respect this symmetry (otherwise all the fermion masses are zero), the symmetry can be treated as an approximate symmetry because all of the fermion masses except top quark mass are much less than the weak scale. Natively one expects the fermion mass and mixing hierarchies can be reproduced if the flavor symmetry is spontaneously broken in steps $U(3)_f \stackrel{V_3}{\rightarrow} U(2)_f \stackrel{V_2}{\rightarrow} U(1)_f \stackrel{V_1}{\rightarrow}$nothing, with $V_3 >> V_2 >> V_1$. Here f represents all kind of the fermions. The Yukawa coupling must be generated through high dimensional non-renormalizable operators when some scalar fields get vacuum expectation values (VEV) to break the flavor symmetry. The hierarchies of fermion mass and mixing are the result of the hierarchy of the flavor symmetry breaking. Indeed this idea has been investigated recently by using a parameterization approach [2, 3]. It can reproduce the fermion mass and mixing hierarchies in a sense of order of magnitude. It naturally suppresses the flavor-changing neutral current (FCNC) in some degree in multi-Higgs doublet models. However it should be noticed that since the third generation is the heaviest one and the top quark mass is at the weak scale, $U(3)_f$ symmetry can be strongly broken down to $U(2)_f$. So $U(2)_f$ symmetry is a better approximation to describe the fermion mass and mixing problem. In this case the first two generation

belongs to an $U(2)_f$ doublet and the third generation belongs to a singlet of $U(2)_f$. As only concerning on the first two generations, this two flavor symmetry approaches are effectively same.

It is well known that in the Minimal Supersymmetric Standard Model (MSSM), the fermion mass and mixing problem remains exactly the same way as that in the SM, therefore the flavor symmetry approach is also used to address this problem in MSSM. Moreover $U(3)_f$ or $U(2)_f$ symmetries provide the needed super-GIM mechanism in scalar-quark sector to suppress FCNC in MSSM, i.e. the first two generation of scalar-quarks must be highly degenerate in order to avoid too large FCNC [4]. With an exact flavor symmetry the three (or the first two) generation scalar-quarks are precisely degenerate. Breaking the flavor symmetry will spoil the degeneracy. How large is the non-degeneracy of the first two generation scalar-quarks is therefore related to the flavor symmetry breaking pattern and the quark mass and mixing values. Based on solely the symmetry ground without assuming further anything on the underlying theory, one may write down all possible non-renormalizable operators allowed by the flavor symmetry and the $SU(2)_L \times U(1)$ gauge symmetry. Some operators contribute to the Yukawa couplings and some contribute to scalar-fermion mass and mass splitting. Generally the lower dimensional operators dominate over the higher dimensional operators. When fermion mass and mixing are generated due to the spontaneous flavor symmetry breaking, scalar-quark mass breaking is produced too. Assuming all the fermions transform under the same flavor group U(3) or U(2) it is found that typically the ratio of the mass square differences over the mass square themselves of all type of the first two generation scalar quarks are around the ratio of the s quark and b quark masses [5]. This leads to a problematic contribution to the ϵ_K parameter of the Kaon physics [6]. To comply with the ϵ_K parameter, one has to have the following choices [5], 1) To specify some concrete underlying models, so that the lower dimensional operators contributing to the squark mass splitting is not allowed[5]. 2) The squark masses are much heavier than weak scale, say $\geq$ 5TeV. 3) CP violating phases are small, $\sim 10^{-2}$, in this case the restriction on squark masses are relaxed, but still they are required to be larger than about 500GeV [5]. 4) Supersymmetry is assumed to be broken by a hidden sector, the widely studied scenario is the gauge-mediated supersymmetry breaking, so that all the supersymmetry breaking interaction terms are real [7].

In this work we investigate the maximal global flavor symmetry group

G_f in MSSM [8]. If G_f is gauged it is well known that gauge contribution in D terms will cause large splitting to the squark masses, so it spoils the super-GIM cancellation mechanism. The crucial point in our theory is that each type of quarks corresponds to different flavor symmetry. For instance the D quark is put in the fundamental representation of $U(3)_D$ or $U(2)_D$. So the D type quark mass and scalar-quark mass generation can be independent in some degree from other type of quarks and scalar-quarks. We find that in MSSM with $tan\beta \leq 1$, the first two generation D type squark mass splitting can be further suppressed by about two order of magnitudes than the typical splitting in a universal flavor symmetry group case for all the fermions, as the breaking scale of $U(3)_D$ is one order of magnitude smaller than other breaking scales of $U(3)_f$. In fact we think it is a very attractive idea in MSSM to address the problems of FCNC and fermion mass generation simultaneously based on flavor symmetry consideration. This leads to a very interesting scenario which may account for many interesting questions in MSSM. Now we come to discuss the scenario.

First we clarify some general assumptions we are going to follow in this work, which are:

1) The global flavor symmetry is the maximal flavor group $G_f = U(3)_Q \times U(3)_U \times U(3)_D \times U(3)_L \times U(3)_E$. However, for most of the discussion in the following, the results are the same if we choose U(2) symmetry instead of U(3).

2) All the coupling constants in the theory are order of one, we expect the fermion mass and mixing patterns are the results of the hierarchies of the flavor symmetry breaking scales.

3) Flavor symmetry is broken only by gauge singlet scalar fields getting VEV. The flavor symmetry is spontaneously broken in steps $U(3)_f \stackrel{V_3}{\rightarrow} U(2)_f \stackrel{V_2}{\rightarrow} U(1)_f \stackrel{V_1}{\rightarrow}$ nothing, with $V_3 >> V_2 >> V_1$. Here f represents all kind of the fermions.

4) Higgs doublets H_u and H_d which finally couple to up and down quarks respectively are the singlets of G_f.

5) We don't specify any model of the flavor physics as the underlying theory, instead we work at low energy scale taking into account all the possible non-renormalizable operators allowed by the symmetry G_f. Only thing here we assume is that there is a high scale of the flavor physics Λ_f. Above this scale one has to work with an underlying theory. Below this scale one has an

effective theory with non-renormalizable operators suppressed by powers of the large scale Λ_f. Λ_f is a scale much higher than the weak scale since spontaneous breaking of global flavor symmetry leads to familons, which constrain $V_f > 10^{10}$GeV [9]

The lowest dimensional G_f invariant operators responsible for fermion mass generation are,

$$W_Y = g_U \bar{Q} U \frac{\phi^Q \phi^U}{\Lambda_f^2} H_u + g_D \bar{Q} D \frac{\phi^Q \phi^D}{\Lambda_f^2} H_d + g_E \bar{L} E \frac{\phi^L \phi^E}{\Lambda_f^2} H_d \qquad (1)$$

where ϕ^f are gauge singlet and $U(3)_f$ triplet. These are dimension six operators. Other representations of G_f can only contribute to the fermion mass through higher dimensional operators. Therefore they are more suppressed by some powers of Λ_f. The higher dimensional operators are important only if the lower dimensional operators are not allowed, which is not the case for the low energy effective theory with most general operators. The couplings g_U, g_D and g_E are assumed approximately to be one. The SM Yukawa couplings are generated when all the $U(3)_f$ symmetries are broken down to nothing. When Λ_f is put at infinity, an exact G_f symmetry is recovered at all energy scales. For a finite Λ_f, G_f will be spontaneously broken below certain symmetry breaking scale. At low energy scale an approximate flavor symmetry G_f is resulted. $U(3)_f$ symmetry can be spontaneously broken down through VEV's of ϕ^f, $< \phi^f >= (V_1^f, V_2^f, V_3^f)$. In fact to break the $U(3)_f$ symmetry at one triplet scalar is not enough. One needs either to consider higher than six dimension operators with other representation scalars of G_f or to introduce another two set of $U(3)_f$ triplet scalar fields ϕ'^f and ϕ''^f. In this work we consider the model with ϕ'^f and ϕ''^f . The VEV's ϕ'^f and ϕ''^f are expressed as $< \phi'^f >= (V_1'^f, V_2'^f, V_3'^f)$ and $< \phi'^f >= (V_1''^f, V_2''^f, V_3''^f)$.

Denoting $\epsilon_{f_i} = \frac{V_i^f}{\Lambda_f}$, $\epsilon'_{f_i} = \frac{V_i'^f}{\Lambda_f}$, and $\epsilon''_{f_i} = \frac{V_i''^f}{\Lambda_f}$ here $i = 1, 2, 3$ is the generation index, the Yukawa couplings generated from the flavor symmetry breaking are given as

$$Y_{ij}^U \simeq (\epsilon_{Q_i} + \epsilon'_{Q_i} + \epsilon''_{Q_i})(\epsilon_{U\,j} + \epsilon'_{U\,j} + \epsilon''_{U\,j}) \qquad (2)$$

and likewise for Y^D and Y^E. We expect the fermion mass and mixing patterns are due to the hierarchy of the flavor symmetry breaking, V_3^f, $V_3'^f$, $V_3''^f >> V_2^f, V_2'^f, V_2''^f >> V_1^f, V_1'^f, V_1''^f$. So we have $\epsilon_{3U,D,E}, \epsilon'_{3U,D,E}, \epsilon''_{3U,D,E} >>$

$\epsilon_{2U,D,E}, \epsilon'_{2U,D,E}, \epsilon''_{2U,D,E} >> \epsilon_{1U,D,E}, \epsilon'_{1U,D,E}, \epsilon''_{1U,D,E}$. At this step, in fact we obtain the approximate flavor symmetry structure of the Yukawa matrix, which is first proposed in Ref.[2]. In principle higher dimensional operators also contribute to the Yukawa matrix. Especially since the top quark is heavy, higher order of ϵ_{Q3}, ϵ_{U3} should not be neglected. However it is still reasonable to believe this Yukawa matrix is correct in the sense of the order of magnitude. At least we can expect these matrices are good approximation for the first two generations. If $U(3)_f$ symmetry is really badly broken in the nature, one may start from the flavor $U(2)_f$ symmetry instead of $U(3)_f$. As we stated above for both cases the following discussions are the similar.

In MSSM with $tan\beta \simeq 1$, all the relations of the ϵ parameters obtained in Ref.[3] by fitting the fermion masses and mixing are the exactly the same here. We will adopt the values of the ϵ parameters in the following investigation. Given all these parameters we can discuss the squark mass splitting and its implications. Supersymmetry breaking terms are the most general ones allowed by the flavor symmetry and the gauge symmetry of the theory. Before the flavor symmetry breaking all the fermions are massless and various generation of scalar-fermions are degenerate. Scalar-fermion mass terms are dimension two operators at this step. Flavor symmetry must be broken to give fermion masses, as the result the scalar-fermion masses split. The splitting of the scalar-fermion masses are induced by the higher dimensional operators as flavor symmetry is broken. The lowest dimensional operators have the form like $m^2_{\tilde{f}} \tilde{f}^i \tilde{f}_j \frac{\phi^i_f \phi_{f_j}}{\Lambda^2_f}$, etc. Hence the splitting are related to the ϵ and ϵ', ϵ'' parameters as,

$$\frac{m^2_{\tilde{f}_i} - m^2_{\tilde{f}_j}}{m^2_{\tilde{f}_i} + m^2_{\tilde{f}_j}} \simeq (\epsilon_{f_i} + \epsilon'_{f_i} + \epsilon''_{f_i})^2 \quad (i > j) \tag{3}$$

Hereafter we will only use ϵ parameter to represent the contributions of all ϵ, ϵ' and ϵ''. This corresponds to a redefining of ϵ as $\epsilon+\epsilon'+\epsilon''$. From this relation one sees that the scalar-fermion mass differences between the third and the first two generations can be as large as the scalar-fermion masses themselves because the third generation is heavy, while the splitting between the first two generations are suppressed by $\epsilon^2_{f_2}$. The values of these parameters are estimated by fitting quark masses and mixing angles as [3]

$$\epsilon_{Q_1}/\epsilon_{Q_2} \simeq 0.2, \quad \epsilon_{Q_2}/\epsilon_{Q_3} \simeq 0.04 \quad \epsilon_{Q_1}/\epsilon_{Q_3} \simeq 0.008$$

$$\epsilon_{U_1}\epsilon_{Q_3} \simeq 0.04\frac{V}{<H_u>}, \quad \epsilon_{U_2}\epsilon_{Q_3} \simeq 0.2\frac{V}{<H_u>}$$
$$\epsilon_{D_1}\epsilon_{Q_3} \simeq 0.006\frac{V}{<H_d>}, \quad \epsilon_{D_2}\epsilon_{Q_3} \simeq 0.025\frac{V}{<H_d>}, \quad \epsilon_{D_3}\epsilon_{Q_3} \simeq 0.03\frac{V}{<H_d>} \tag{4}$$

here $V = 175$GeV, $< H_u >$ and $< H_d >$ are VEVs of H_u and H_d fields. If $\tan\beta = 1$ we go back to the result of Ref[3]. The fact that ϵ_{D_2} is much smaller than ϵ_{U_2} is because c quark is much heavier than s quark. While a small ϵ_{D_2} implies a small mass splitting for the first two generation scalar-down quarks $\delta m^2_{\tilde{D}}$. This is very different from the model where all the fermions are put in the same flavor symmetry group. Generally here in our model $\delta m^2_{\tilde{D}}$ is about two order of magnitude smaller if $\tan\beta \simeq 1$. Due to the smallness of $\delta m^2_{\tilde{D}}$ we expect the contribution to ϵ_K in the theory is not too large to cause any problem.

Now we come to discuss the most interesting implications of our theory in particle phenomenology

Supersymmetric ϵ_K problem In SUSY models there are additional CP violation sources which can contribute to K meson system CP violation. The contributions to the CP violating ϵ_K parameter of K meson system is dominated by diagrams involving Q, D squarks and gluino in the same loop. For $m_{\tilde{g}} \simeq m_{\tilde{Q}} \simeq m_{\tilde{D}} \simeq \tilde{m}$, here $m_{\tilde{g}}$ is gluino mass, and considering only the contribution from the first two generation squark families, one gets [6, 10]

$$\epsilon_K = \frac{5\alpha_3^2}{162\sqrt{2}}\frac{f_K^2 m_K}{\tilde{m}^2\Delta m_K}\left[\left(\frac{m_K}{m_s+m_d}\right)^2 + \frac{3}{25}\right] Im\left\{\frac{V_{11}^Q \delta m^2_{\tilde{Q}} V_{21}^{Q*}}{m^2_{\tilde{Q}}}\frac{V_{11}^D \delta m^2_{\tilde{D}} V_{21}^{D*}}{m^2_{\tilde{D}}}\right\} \tag{5}$$

where $\delta m^2_{\tilde{Q},\tilde{D}}$ are the mass square differences between the first and second families of squarks. Flavor mixing matrices $V^{Q,D}$ are the coupling matrices in the vertex $\tilde{g}-\tilde{Q}-Q$ and $\tilde{g}-\tilde{D}-D$ where both quark and squark matrices are diagonal. Using the experimental value of ϵ_K, one gets

$$(\frac{100\text{GeV}}{\tilde{m}})^2\left[\frac{V_{11}^Q \delta m^2_{\tilde{Q}} V_{21}^{Q*}}{m^2_{\tilde{Q}}}\frac{V_{11}^D \delta m^2_{\tilde{D}} V_{21}^{D*}}{m^2_{\tilde{D}}}\right]\sin\phi \leq 0.5\times 10^{-8} \tag{6}$$

where $\phi = arg(V_{11}^Q V_{21}^{Q*} V_{11}^D V_{21}^{D*})$. In our theory $\delta m^2_{\tilde{Q},\tilde{D}}$ is estimated from

Eq.[3] and $V^{Q,D}$ can also be estimated as the following

$$V_{11}^{Q,D} \simeq 1, V_{21}^{Q} \simeq \frac{\epsilon_{Q_1}}{\epsilon_{Q_2}} \simeq 0.2, V_{21}^{D} \simeq \frac{\epsilon_{D_1}}{\epsilon_{D_2}} \simeq 0.24 \tag{7}$$

Therefore we obtain the following constraint

$$(\frac{100\text{GeV}}{\tilde{m}})^2(\frac{V}{< H_d >})^2 \sin\phi \leq 0.1 \tag{8}$$

This constraint can be easily satisfied with $\tan\beta \simeq 1$ either requiring $\phi \leq 0.1$ or $\tilde{m} \geq 300$GeV. It is easy to check that the contribution involving the third family squarks via (13) and (23) mixing elements is comparable to that from the first two families.

Neutron electric dipole moment d_n In SUSY model d_n is dominated by the one loop gluino diagrams [11]

$$d_n \simeq M_d \frac{e\alpha_3}{18\pi\tilde{m}^4}(|Am_{\tilde{g}}| \sin\phi_A + \tan\beta|\mu m_{\tilde{g}}| \sin\phi_B) \tag{9}$$

here all the parameters have the conventional definitions in SUSY models. If one only considers the first generation squark contribution. M_d is the d quark mass. Certainly the second and the third families of squarks may also contribute to d_n through the mixing matrices $V^{Q,D,U}$. Their contributions to M_d can be expressed as $V_{1i}^{Q}V_{1i}^{D}m_i$ (i=s,b) or $V_{1i}^{Q}V_{1i}^{U}m_i$ (i=c,t). Using values of $V^{Q,D,U}$ and the quark masses we find that the contribution from the second and third families of squarks do not exceed the contribution from the first generation. Hence the supersymmetric d_n problem remains the same in our theory. In order to avoid too large d_n, as usual one has to either require $\tilde{m}$ as large as order of TeV, or CP violating phase as small as 10^{-2}.

Baryogenesis of the universe It is widely realized that in order to generate the observed baryon asymmetry of the universe, by using electroweak baryon number violation one needs some new physics beyond the SM at the weak scale. The reason is that in the SM CP violation effect is not strong enough and the electroweak phase transition is at best weakly first order [12]. SUSY is the most promising extension of the SM in this respect as it possibly provides a stronger electroweak phase transition and some new sources of CP violation.

In MSSM the electroweak phase transition can be sufficiently strong first order due to the large coupling of a light stop to the Higgs boson. And it is

demonstrated that the phase transition is strong enough whenever [13]

$$m_h \lesssim 80\mathrm{GeV}, \mathrm{m_A} \gtrsim 200\mathrm{GeV}, \tan\beta \lesssim 2.5, \mathrm{m_{\tilde{t}_R}} \leq 175\mathrm{GeV}, \tilde{\mathrm{A}}_\mathrm{t} \simeq 0 \qquad (10)$$

here m_h is the mass of the lightest Higgs boson, m_A is that of the pseudoscalar Higgs boson, and $\tilde{A}_t$ is the effective $\tilde{t}_L - \tilde{t}_R$ mixing parameter. These limits are slightly relaxed if one includes two-loop QCD effects [14].

Recent investigation shows that with MSSM parameters chosen in above region, the new sources of CP violation in squark sector or Higgs sector may generate the required amount of baryon asymmetry of the universe during the electroweak phase transition [15]. Here we would like to point out that all the conditions for the required baryogenesis can be satisfied in our theory, while at the same time our theory provides a solution to ϵ_K and d_n problems. To be more specific we present a model as an example in the following.

First of all we assume $\tilde{m} \simeq 100\mathrm{GeV}$, so that new physics effect from SUSY appears at weak scale. In order to evade the d_n problem we have to choose the CP violating phases around 10^{-2}. This can be naturally achieved by assuming that CP is an approximate symmetry in the model. If so ϵ_K cannot be accounted for by CKM CP violating phase. However the ϵ_K is possibly dominantly contributed by the SUSY diagrams. In fact with $\tan\beta \simeq 3$ and $\tilde{m} \simeq 100\mathrm{GeV}$, $\phi \simeq 10^{-2}$ Eq.[5] gives the needed contribution to ϵ_K. With the small value of $\tan\beta$ and given the squark and gluino masses at weak scale the required conditions of baryogenesis can be filled. Form now on we discuss the experimental consequences of the model with parameters chosen as above. As we have seen this model may solve the supersymmetric ϵ_K and d_n problems and possibly provide an answer to the generation of the baryon asymmetry of the universe.

Direct CP violating effects in the K meson decays will be contributed both from CKM source and new sources in supersymmetric breaking sectors. CKM contribution to $|\epsilon'_K/\epsilon_K|$ will be order of 10^{-5} since the CKM phase is order of 10^{-2}. However the contribution from SUSY breaking terms is quite model dependent. It can be as large as 10^{-3} [4, 6, 16]. B factories are going to test the CKM mechanism of CP violation. If the CP violating phase is as small as 10^{-2} in CKM matrix, its CP violating effect is too small to be observed in B factory [18].

For $B^0 - \bar{B}^0$, $D^0 - \bar{D}^0$ and $K^0 - \bar{K}^0$ mixing we estimate the SUSY contributions to the B, D and K meson mass differences in our model and

find that their contributions are well below the experimental values. For B and K systems the contributions from SUSY are smaller than that from the SM. And for D meson system SUSY contribution is close to the contribution from the short distance SM box diagram. So we see that this model is quite weakly constrained from the measurement of $B^0 - \bar{B}^0$, $D^0 - \bar{D}^0$ and $K^0 - \bar{K}^0$ mixing. And it does not predict an observable mixing effect in D meson system in the future experiments. In other words if the mixing effects of D meson system is found in the future experiments, it means this mixing effect is either from SM long distance contributions or from some new physics effects beyond this model.

While neutron electric dipole moment d_n is close to its experimental bound in this model, we find the electron electric dipole moment can be close to its lower experimental bound too. A recent work computes the general contribution of one-loop electric dipole moment of electron in the framework of MSSM [17]. It includes the full set of neutralino states in the loop. Using the result of this work we find that with $\tilde{m} \simeq 100\text{GeV}$, $\phi \simeq 10^{-2}$ electron electric dipole moment is estimated about $10^{-26} - 10^{-27}$e-cm, which is close to its current experimental bound. An improvement of the measurement of neutron and electron dipole moments will possibly discover new physics effects studied in this model.

Finally we consider the FCNC in lepton sector. The most interesting processes are the lepton decays $\mu \to e\gamma$ and $\tau \to e(\mu)\gamma$. These processes happen at one loop level where the sleptons and gauginos are in the loops. Lepton family number is violated through the non-diagonal elements of the slepton mass matrices or the left- and right-handed slepton mixing matrices. The general formula for the decay rates of these processes have been derived[19, 20]. We use these formula to estimate these decay rates in our model. As an reasonable estimation we choose all the new mass parameters at 100GeV, we find that the dominant contribution is from the left-right mixing diagrams. This was pointed out in Ref.[20], though there a different framework is discussed. We estimate the decay rates of $l_i \to l_j\gamma$ as, where i, j are family index and $i > j$,

$$\Gamma(\mu_i \to \mu_j\gamma) \simeq 2 \times 10^{-19} m_{l_i}^5 {V_{ij}^{L,E}}^2 \text{GeV}^{-4} \tag{11}$$

Where $V^{L,E}$ are mixing matrice in the coupling vertex of lepton-slepton-photino, $\tilde{\gamma} - l(E) - \tilde{L}(\tilde{E})$. In terms of ϵ parametrs

$$V_{ij}^{L,E} \simeq \epsilon_i^{L,E} \epsilon_j^{L,E} \tag{12}$$

These mixing matrices are not determined by solely fitting lepton masses. Nevertheless if we assume $\epsilon_i^E \simeq \epsilon_j^L$ these parameters can be approximated as

$$\left(\epsilon_1^{L,E}\right)^2 \simeq 3\times10^{-6}\frac{V}{<H_d>}, \quad \left(\epsilon_2^{L,E}\right)^2 \simeq 6\times10^{-4}\frac{V}{<H_d>}, \quad \left(\epsilon_1^{L,E}\right)^2 \simeq 10^{-3}\frac{V}{<H_d>} \tag{13}$$

Then we predict the branching ratios as $Br(\mu \to e\gamma) \simeq 2 \times 10^{-13}$ and $Br(\tau \to \mu\gamma) \simeq 10^{-11}$. All these decay rates are too low to violate current experimental limits and it is difficult to observe them in the near future experiments.

In summary we study the maximal flavor symmetry in the framework of MSSM. We consider the low energy effective theory of the flavor physics with all the possible operators included. In this theory we find the supersymmetric ϵ_K problem is solved and d_n problem remains the same as in MSSM. To fix both problems and to generate the required baryon number asymmetry of the universe, we propose a model where all the SUSY particles are as heavy as about 100GeV and the CP violation phases are about 10^{-2}. This model is natural because the superpartners are lighter than TeV and the small CP violation phase is protected by the CP symmetry. This model predicts the electron electric dipole close to its current experimental bound. Therefore we expect that about one order of magnitude improvement on d_n and d_e measurements may discover these new physics effects. As the superpartners masses are around 100GeV in the model, the next generation collider experiments like LHC, Tevatron will certainly produce a lot of numbers of these particles.

This work is supported by the National Science Foundation of China (NSFC).

References

[1] F. Wilczek and A. Zee, Phys. Rev. Lett. 42 (1979) 421; F. Wilczek, Phys. Rev. Lett. 49 (1982) 1549; G. Gelmini, S. Nussinov and T. Yanagida, Nucl. Phys. B 219 (1983) 31; D. Chang, P. pal and G. Senjanović, Phys. Lett. B 153 (1985) 407; Z. Tao, Phys. Lett. B 355 (1995) 518.

[2] A. Antaramian, L. J. Hall and A. Rasin, Phys. Rev. Lett. 69 (1992) 1871.

[3] L. J. Hall and S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. D48 (1993) R979.

[4] For a recent review, to see Y. Grossman, Y. Nir and R. Rattazzi, hep-ph/9701231.

[5] A. Pomarol and D. Tommasini, Nucl .Phys. B 466 (1996) 3; R. Barbieri, G. Dvali and L. Hall, Phys. Lett. B 377 (1996) 76; R. Barbieri, L. Hall and A. Romanino, Phys. Lett. B 401 (1997) 47.

[6] Y. Nir, Nucl. Phys. B 273, (1986) 567; F. Gabbiani, E. Gabrielli, A. Masiero and L. Silvestrini, Nucl. Phys. B477 (1996) 321.

[7] M. Dine and A. Nelson, Phys. Rev. D48 (1993)1277; M. Dine, A. Nelson and Y. Shirman, Phys. Rev. D51 (1995) 1362; M. Dine, A. Nelson, Y. Nir and Y. Shirman, Phys. Rev. D53 (1996) 2658.

[8] L. Hall and L. Randall, Phys. Rev. Lett. 65, 2939(1990).

[9] M. Turner, Phys. Rev. Lett. 60 (1988) 1797; M. Morgan and G. Miller, Phys. Lett. B 179 (1986) 379.

[10] J. S. Hagelin, S. Kelley and T. Tanaka, Nucl. Phys. B 415 (1994) 293.

[11] W. Buchmuller and D. Wyler, Phys. Lett. B121 (1983) 321; J. Polchinski and M. Wise, Phys. Lett. B 125 (1983) 393.

[12] For a review see A. Cohen, D. Kaplan and A. Nelson, Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci. 43 (1993) 27.

[13] M. Carena, M. Quiros and C. Wagner, Phys. Lett. B 380 (1996) 81.

[14] J. Espinosa, Nucl. Phys. B 475 (1996) 273; B. de Carlos and J. Espinosa, hep-ph/9703212.

[15] M P. Worah, hep-ph/9704389; A. Riotto, hep-ph/9709286.

[16] K.S. Babu and S.M. Barr, Phys. Rev. Lett. 72 (1994) 2831.

[17] P. Nath, Phys. Rev. Lett. 66 (1991) 2565.

[18] Y. Nir and U. Sarid, Phys. Rev. D47 (1993) 2818.

[19] F. Borzumati and A. Masiero, Phys. Rev. Lett. 57 (1986) 961; G. K. Leontaris, K. Tanvakis and J. D. Vergados, Phys. Lett. B 171 (1986) 412.

[20] J. Hisano, T. Moroi, M. Yamaguchi and T. Yanagida, Phys. Lett. B357 (1995) 579.